

Calvin L. Litsey (SBN 289659)  
Faegre Baker Daniels LLP  
1950 University Avenue, Suite 450  
East Palo Alto, CA 94303-2279  
Telephone: +1 650 324-6700  
Facsimile: +1 650 324-6701  
[calvin.litsey@FaegreBD.com](mailto:calvin.litsey@FaegreBD.com)

Kathy L. Osborn (*pro hac vice*)  
Ryan M. Hurley (*pro hac vice*)  
Faegre Baker Daniels LLP  
300 N. Meridian Street, Suite 2700  
Indianapolis, IN 46204  
Telephone: +1 317-237-0300  
Facsimile: +1 317-237-1000  
[kathy.osborn@FaegreBD.com](mailto:kathy.osborn@FaegreBD.com)  
[ryan.hurley@FaegreBD.com](mailto:ryan.hurley@FaegreBD.com)

Jeffrey S. Roberts (*pro hac vice*)  
Faegre Baker Daniels LLP  
3200 Wells Fargo  
1700 Lincoln Street  
Denver, CO 80203  
Telephone: +1 303 607 3500  
Facsimile: +1 303 607 3600  
[jeff.roberts@FaegreBD.com](mailto:jeff.roberts@FaegreBD.com)

*Attorneys for Defendants Thomson S.A. and  
Thomson Consumer Electronics, Inc.*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

IN RE CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)  
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

No. 07-cv-5944-SC  
MDL No. 1917

This Document Relates to:

*Sharp Electronics Corp. et al. v. Hitachi,  
Ltd. Et al., No. 13-cv-01173*

**DECLARATION OF JEFFREY S.  
ROBERTS IN SUPPORT OF  
STIPULATION AND PROPOSED ORDER  
RE EXTENSION OF BRIEFING  
SCHEDULE**

[STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER  
RE EXTENSION OF BRIEFING SCHEDULE  
FILED CONCURRENTLY HEREWITH]

Case No. 07-5944-SC; MDL No. 1917

ROBERTS DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF [PROPOSED] ORDER RE EXTENSION OF BRIEFING  
SCHEDULE

1 I, Jeffrey S. Roberts, hereby declare under penalty of perjury as follows:

2 1. I am an active member in good standing of the bar of the State of Colorado and on July 31,  
3 2013 I was granted leave to appear *pro have vice* [Dkt. No. 1819]. I am an attorney with the firm  
4 Faegre Baker Daniels LLP, counsel to Defendants Thomson S.A. and Thomson Consumer  
5 Electronics, Inc. ("Thomson Consumer"). I submit this declaration in support of Thomson  
6 Consumer's Stipulation and Proposed Order regarding Extension of Briefing Schedule in relation to  
7 Plaintiffs Sharp Electronics Corp. and Sharp Electronics Manufacturing Company of America,  
8 Inc.'s (collectively, "Sharp's") Objections to Special Master Legge's Order Staying Discovery.

9 2. On March 15, 2013, Sharp filed its Complaint against Thomson Consumer and Thomson  
10 S.A.

11 3. On May 17, 2013, Thomson Consumer filed a Motion to Dismiss [Dkt. No. 1677] the claims  
12 alleged against it in the Sharp's Complaint pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). The Motion to  
13 Dismiss is fully briefed and awaiting a hearing. The hearing will be rescheduled pending a ruling  
14 from Judge Conti on pending appeals of the Special Master's orders on the motions to dismiss of  
15 other direct action defendants.

16 4. On August 9, 2013, Sharp filed its Objections to Special Master Legge's Order Staying  
17 Discovery against Thomson Consumer. No hearing on this matter is currently set.

18 5. On August 15, 2013 I contacted Blaise Warren and Craig Benson, both counsel for Sharp,  
19 by email and requested an extension of time for Thomson Consumer to file its response to Sharp's  
20 Objections to Special Master Legge's Order Staying Discovery necessitated by the fact that  
21 Thomson Consumer's attorneys are currently engaged in numerous depositions in an unrelated  
22 matter. That same day, I contacted Mr. Warren by telephone and further discussed the requested  
23 extension with him. Less than one hour later, Mr. Warren informed me by email that Sharp agrees  
24 that the deadline for Thomson Consumer to file its response would be extended from August 16,  
25 2013 until August 26, 2013.

26 6. No party will be prejudiced by this brief extension of time for Thomson Consumer to file its  
27 response to Sharp's Objections to Special Master Legge's Order Staying Discovery, nor will this  
28 extension adversely impact the schedule of this case.

Executed this August 16, 2013 at Denver, Colorado.

/s/ Jeffrey S. Roberts

Jeffrey S. Roberts

Pursuant to Local Rule 5-1(i), the filer attests that the concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from the above signatory.

Dated: August 16, 2013

By: /s/ Calvin L. Litsey